



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

[Handwritten signature]

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/345,195	06/30/1999	BENOIT JULES JURION	13237-2425	9936
27488	7590	04/08/2004	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			SINGH, RACHNA	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2176	21	
DATE MAILED: 04/08/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/345,195	JURION ET AL.	
	Examiner Rachna Singh	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5,7-18 and 23-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 14-18 and 25-32 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-2, 7-13, and 23-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 3-5 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment, filed 03/22/04; RCE filed 3/22/04.

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/22/04 has been entered.

2. Claims 1-5, 7-18 and 23-31 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 14, 16, 17, 18, and 27 are independent claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 14-18, and 25-32 are allowed.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 3-5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim 1, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-2, 7-13, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sun, US Patent 5,802,482, 09/01/98.

In reference to independent claim 1, Sun teaches a method and system for processing graphic language characters comprising the following steps:

-Receiving a character from a file system or keyboard of a foreign language with various combination rules. See figure 6 and columns 1-2. Compare to "***receiving a first character of a complex character***".

-Determining if the character is part of a valid sequence according to the combining rules of a foreign language. See column 1-2 and figure 6. Compare to "***determining whether the first character may begin a valid sequence of characters for forming a complex character according to the rules associated with the selected language***".

-Outputting in a display one or more character strings in accordance with said layout field. See column 8. Compare to "***if the first character may begin a valid sequence of character for forming a complex character according to rules associated with the selected language, accepting the first character for display***".

-If the character forms an invalid sequence, signaling an error and prompting the user for new input. See figure 6. Compare to "***if the first character may not begin a valid sequence. . .prohibiting accepting the first character for display***".

- Outputting in a display one or more character strings in accordance with said layout field. See column 8. Compare to "***if the first character is accepted for display,***

displaying the complex character formed by the first character to the user on a display screen prior to receiving any additional characters indicating to the user that the first character may begin a valid sequence of characters for forming a complex character according to rules associated with the selected language".

Sun differs from the claimed invention in that he initially stores the characters in a header and stores the data structure in memory which is later retrieved by the output device for display; however, he still determines if the display is part of a valid sequence, thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to display characters as they are validated as illustrated by Sun as it provides the user with a visual of the character being formed. Moreover, as illustrated in figure 6, Sun receives each character from an input and determines if it is part of a valid sequence and if it is not it signals an error. If the character is a valid sequence, it places the character in a register and waits for the next character. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to visually represent this process as it allows a user to see the characters that he is inputting into the system in conjunction with the additional characters.

In reference to claim 2, Sun teaches receiving a series of inputs and determining whether the append to the previous characters following language rules (combination rules). See figure 6. The process taught in reference to claim 1, can be carried out multiple times as characters are appended to the complex character. See figure 6 and columns 1-2.

In reference to claim 7, Sun teaches prohibiting invalid characters and appending valid characters. See figure 6 and columns 1-2.

In reference to claims 8 and 10, Sun teaches the addition of a simple character to form a complex character. See columns 1-2.

In reference to claim 9, Sun's method allows the user to enter multiple characters for appending to the next. Thus a first character could comprise of two or more characters. See columns 1-2 and figure 6.

In reference to claims 11-13, Sun teaches the system for use in languages such as Thai, Vietnamese, and various other foreign languages. See columns 1-2.

In reference to claim 23, Sun teaches appending a second character if it is part of a valid sequence. See figure 6.

In reference to claim 24, Sun teaches that a correct sequence is validated then displayed to the user on a display screen according to rules of a language. See figure 6.

Response to Arguments

7. In view of Applicant's amendment filed 3/22/04, claims 3-5, 14-18, and 25-32 are allowed. Claims 1-2, 7-13, and 23-24 stand rejected in light of the rejections above and comments below.

In reference to claim 1, Applicant argues that Sun does not teach displaying a character and combination to the user. As stated above in the rejections, Sun differs from the claimed invention in that he initially stores the characters in a header and stores the data structure in memory which is later retrieved by the output

device for display; however, he still determines if the display is part of a valid sequence, thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to display characters as they are validated as illustrated by Sun since it provides a visual to the user creating the character sequence. Moreover, as illustrated in figure 6, Sun receives each character from an input and determines if it is part of a valid sequence and if it is not it signals an error. If the character is a valid sequence, it places the character in a register and waits for the next character. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to visually represent this process as it allows a user to see the characters that he is inputting into the system in conjunction with the additional characters.

In reference to claim 2, Sun teaches receiving a series of inputs and determining whether to append it to the previous characters following language rules (combination rules). See figure 6. The process taught in reference to claim 1, can be carried out multiple times as characters are appended to the complex character. See figure 6 and columns 1-2.

Applicants further argue that Sun teaches away from the invention in that he allows meaningless data structures to be generated. Examiner disagrees since Sun discloses that a signal error is generated for a character that produces an invalid sequence. Moreover, Sun's system is based on combining rules of a language and does not allow characters that do not meet the rules to be displayed. So while Sun may allow the user to enter a wrong character, he only does so upon notifying the user of the invalid sequence. See figure 6.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent 5,873,111 Edberg

US Patent 6,411,948 Hetherington et al.

US Patent 6,272,495 Hetherington et al.

Bishop, F. Avery, David C. Brown, and David M. Meltzer, "Supporting Multilanguage Text Layout and Complex Scripts with Windows 2000", November 1998, Microsoft Systems Journal, available:

<http://www.microsoft.com/typography/developers/uniscribe/intro.htm>.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachna Singh whose telephone number is 703.305.1952. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on 703.305.9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Application/Control Number: 09/345,195
Art Unit: 2176

Page 8

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RS
4/2/04



JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER